DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 457 JC 750 477

AUTHOR McCuskey, E. Scott; Worley, William E.
TITLE Study of the Discipline-Based Education vs. Liberal Education in the Department of Social Sciences, S. P. J. C. [St. Petersburg Junior College, Florida].
INSTITUTION Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE 14 Jun 74
NOTE 28p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; College Curriculum; *Core Courses; *Elective Subjects; *General Education; *Junior Colleges; Personal Growth; Practicums; Social Sciences; Specialization; *Terminal Students; Transfer Students; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Saint Petersburg Junior College

ABSTRACT

The heterogeneous nature of community college populations has resulted in an academic dichotomy within two-year institutions. Most institutions offer two types of programs: (1) discipline-based, university parallel programs, oriented toward transferring students to four-year institutions; (2) vocational/technical programs, oriented toward terminal degrees. Since two-year colleges are unique institutions with philosophy and goals to justify their separate existence, a more coherent educational approach is needed, identified as "liberal education." Liberal education seeks not only mastery of bodies of information, but coherence among them, enhancing personal development. The curriculum of a discipline-based social science department was studied by developing a "program-priority-value-matrix." Three factors were used: (1) program priority; (2) student demand priority; (3) cost per credit hour. The hypothesis that decision-making curriculum managers perpetuate the dichotomy between discipline-based and vocational/technical education was sustained; social science courses had little or no demand/priority in vocational programs. A policy of 40 percent specilization requirements, 40 percent general education requirements, and 20 percent electives is recommended, so that a student can break out of the rigid "tracking" system. (NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED111457

STUDY OF THE DISCIPLINE-BASED EDUCATION-VS.-LIBERAL EDUCATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, S.P.J.C.

By:
E. Scott McCuskey, Ed.D.
and
William E. Worley, Ed.D.

A Practicum Presented to Nova University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

June 14, 1974

SP 750 427

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1
A. Summary 1
B. Specific Problem 1-2
C. Movement to liberal education 2-3
D. Schools of thought 3
E. Study of Social Science Department 4

II. Definition of Terms 5

III. Hypotheses 5-6
A. Researchers' Hypothesis 5
B. A null hypothesis 6

IV. Assumptions and Limitations 6

V. Significance of Problem and Literature 7
A. Three problem areas (liberal education) 7-12
B. Developmental studies 12
C. Transitional stage 13

VI. Implications of Related Research in the Study 15
A. Literature 15
B. Model 15-16

VII. Procedures 16-19
A. Analysis of data 18-19

VIII. Results 20-21

IX. Recommendations 21-22

Table I: Programs and Courses Offered in Social Sciences, S.P.J.C. 23

Table II: Cumulative Student Course Program Priority Matrix, Department of Social Sciences, S.P.J.C. 24

Bibliography 25

STUDY OF THE DISCIPLINE-BASED EDUCATION-VS.-LIBERAL EDUCATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, S.P.J.C.

I. Introduction

A. The Community College movement is relatively new as an institution. It has come in four varieties: Private two-year liberal arts schools; private schools for those unable to meet admission requirements at the four-year institution; public junior colleges (state supported); and vocational-technical-general education institutions (Thornton, 1960; Moore, 1970; Gleazer, 1968-73).

The past decade, the junior college or community junior college has come of age (Moore, 1970; Gleazer, 1973). With this change have come radical demands to open the door to all students (Roueche, 1973; Moore, 1970; Gleazer, 1968-73).

B. The specific problem this study attempted to analyze, and offer a cure, was namely, "that the junior colleges were oriented toward a discipline-based approach to curricula while the vocational-technical, continuing education oriented institutions were bypassed. To put it more succinctly, the discipline-based structure was oriented toward university parallel programs and the latter was oriented toward the "non-university-material" students. This dichotomy presented a

division whereby the "two-year colleges" were being forced to change. The two-year institutions were not just appendages of the university systems, nor were they to be considered a step-child to the elite systems of education. They were unique institutions with services to justify their separate existence.

C. "If higher education is to contribute ... (to educational demands of the two-year college students), the time for action is now"(Gleazer, 1973). Specifically, the researchers attempted to study one department in the college (Social Sciences), to ascertain if it was utilizing a discipline-based approach to the total college curricula.

D. The movement to Liberal Education* as a viable alternative to discipline-based curricula** has the potential to change the orientation, structure and goals of community colleges in the U.S.A. "If higher education is to contribute (to the movement) ... the time for action is now" (Gleazer, 1973).

---

* Liberal Education will mean education which seeks mastery of bodies of information and knowledge, but coherence among them, that enhances personal development...competence in shaping of physical and social world we inhabit and a philosophy of life adequate for the individual life-style.

**Disciplinary-based curricula are by design specialized constellations - paradigms - of assumptions and methodologies. The disciplines are "eyes," as it were, through which the world is seen and analyzed; they impose particular agendas and points of view that have in practice produced even finer degrees of specialization and refinement.

The major issue the researchers attempted to deal with in this study was related to the main question, "Is the discipline basis in education adequate for the organization of liberal learning?" In the past, reforms have been extraordinarily difficult to achieve...not always due to intransigence, but due to the inadequate understanding of factors which facilitate or inhibit change.

E. Dr. William Van Til (January, 1974) identifies four schools of thought as to the best education for twentieth-century Americans. His synthesis moves from the learner and his needs, values, social realities, to the discipline approach. He is suggesting change, as does Gleazer (1973), as he says that the educational mission has changed and the structure (framework) presents a change lag, or dead-end planning.

1. The change-lag in the Department of Social Sciences is visible in the discipline-basis for course offering determination. It could be referred to as the traditional approach where courses are offered based on past results and faculty structure needs instead of program-student needs. There is a tendency to look behind rather than ahead and too many of the instructors are "married" to their disciplines rather than assuming a

comprehensive approach toward the teaching of the Social Sciences. Concepts such as: don't rock the boat - keep the faculty happy (a maintenance of the status quo), seem to override the desire for any significant change. The researchers attempted to offer a more efficient and constructive model to match resources, demands and productivity within the decision-making process (governance) for the purpose of ensuring a more realistic and timely response to student needs.

2. S.P.J.C. is in the process of developing a change in structure, orientation, and goals from a discipline-based curricula to a program-based approach. This change is in the future (1975-76) as the schedule now reads. (Dr. Norman Stephens, Director of Educational Planning and Research).

F. This study attempted to study the Department of Social Sciences, S.P.J.C., in relation to one facet of this change - namely, "How does the Department of Social Sciences make decisions on <u>resources</u> and <u>productivity</u> in course scheduling to reflect the needs of the students, social realities, humanistic values and the disciplines?"

The researchers attempted to develop a model - a rank order priority system - to use in the evaluation of this question.

The model or composite-priority matrix development attempted to evaluate the present system of scheduling courses and its adequacy in meeting program based student demands. Also, the question of program-course demands should indicate some data on the institution's commitment to liberal education.

II. Definition of Terms:

S	-	Student
SS	-	Students
DBO	-	Discipline-based curricula
PBO	-	Program-based curricula
SPJC	-	St. Petersburg Junior College
SS	-	Department of Social Sciences, S.P.J.C.
CPPM	-	Course Program Priority Matrix
SD	-	Student demands for course hours
CD	-	Cost demand per credit hour
CRV	-	Cumulative Program-Cost-Student demand priority value
PSDV	-	Priority Student Demand Value
PCDV	-	Priority Cost Demand Value

III. Hypotheses:

A. The researchers hypothesized that the decision-making managers attempt to perpetuate the study of discipline-based education, and/or Program-Technical-Vocational-based education exclusive of the need for liberal education in the community college.

B. A null hypothesis that both discipline-based education and Program-Technical-Vocational education show no significant differences in their decisions to perpetuate the dichotomy instead of attempting a synthesis of the two.

IV. Assumptions and Limitations

1. This study was limited to one social science department. Therefore, it is a specific study and should not be generalized to other departments or colleges without further testing.
2. This study assumes liberal education and general education vis-a-vis Moore, Gleazer, et al, has similar meaning and is a higher value than traditional elite education for the community college student.
3. The assigned values for the three demand areas - student demand, program course demand and cost per credit hour demand - were arbitrarily and subjectively set to give student demands a high priority value over cost demands.
4. The assignment of a priority value for each of the five areas was projected after reading Thornton, 1960; Moore, 1970; Roueche, 1968; and Gleazer, 1973. The 'priority-scale' for the model was assigned with a student-orientation bias in the researchers' conceptual perspectives.

5. The model developed for CPPM should give more systematic and orderly scheduling of courses based upon objective criteria. However, there will be a need to test this model over several years to authenticate its worth.
6. In assessing the value of 'specialized education,' general education and electives, the researchers used Thornton, 1960 (p. 189 -- a 40%-40%-20% respective).

V. Significance of the Problem and Literature

A. The problem manifests itself in three areas. First, if a liberal education in the community college is to be a fact for all students, the decision-makers will have to move from the "rationalistic" philosophy of higher education (i.e., the community college), and will have to at least attempt to consider the "realistic" philosophy in higher education. "The rationalist position assumes 'that the distinctive factor in man is his rationality, and the cultivation of man's reason is the sole aim of education, or, of life itself.' " (Thornton, 1960, p.4) "The realist position, on the other hand, emphasizes the aphorism that the verb 'teach' has an indirect object, the learner, as well as a direct object, the subject matter." (Ibid., p.5)

The 'realist' concludes that all men share common needs - as citizens, as individuals, as family members. Therefore, he feels obligated to educate individuals to these ends. This is Gleazer's view (1973) as in Moore's (1970) philosophical orientation.

The researchers have adopted the 'realist' perspective on higher education and have attempted to open the door of the community college to at least a small degree to the "other than university elite student," or the type students described in Gleazer, Moore, Roueche, Thornton and Van Til.

Thornton puts it succinctly as he says:

> "Many able youths have abilities which are not traditionally valued by the college; either they are not attracted to the college or they leave it because nothing in the curriculum seems to have value or meaning for them. On the other hand, the social groups that now do not desire or aspire to college at one time in our history could not read or write; at a later period, they withdrew their children from school at ten or twelve or fourteen years of age, although now they "look favorably on a high school education." If we can provide early identification and guidance of talented young people, local opportunities for higher education at minimum cost to the student, and curriculums clearly relevant to the demands of modern times, many more of these able students will be encouraged to complete two or four or even more years of college. The value to the nation of such an outcome would far exceed its cost." (1960, p.11)

Moore, somewhat more caustic in his criticism of the "open door," says:

"Too often the term open-door is hypocritical rhetoric. It is a catch phrase which implies every student can enroll in the college. Open-door means more than the idea that every student with a high school diploma can go to college. It also means that the student, regardless of his level of achievement, will receive the best education possible in the college commensurate with his needs, efforts, motivation, and abilities. In reality, however, most community colleges develop the traditional programs and curricula which prepare able students to transfer to the senior institution, or terminal students to go directly into employment. The overwhelming majority of two-year institutions neither develop the same commitment, establish the same priorities nor utilize the same precision and creativity in developing the programs and curricula for the educationally disadvantaged student as they do for the able student. This student is one of the academically overlooked - or, perhaps, ignored. Disregard for the marginal student is one of the provocative footnotes which demonstrate the inability of higher education to come to terms in dealing with the non-traditional college student. In this way, post-secondary education has made little or no attempt to manage change or to match the prevailing needs with the times." (1970, p.5)

Van Til lists the four major schools of thought:

"I think we can identify at least four schools of thought as to the best education for twentieth-century Americans. At the risk of oversimplification, we will call them (1) the view which stressed the needs of the learner, (2) the view which stressed social realities, (3) the view which emphasized values, and (4) the approach which stressed teaching the disciplines." (1973, p.3)

Then, Van Til concludes:

"I still know of no better education than that to which John Dewey aspired, an education which recognized the

importance of the needs and interests of the individual learner, which illuminated social realities, which helped clarify value choices, and which, in time, eventuated in the understanding of organized subject matter." (Ibid, p.13)

If Roueche's criteria for the 'open-door' is acceptable:

"Some colleges will set certain selective standards for admission and retention of students, but community colleges will keep their doors open to any person, youth or adult, who can profit by what the colleges can offer, and the colleges will strive to offer what the people can profit by.

The basic criterion for admission to a community junior college is graduation from high school. Individuals eighteen years of age and over who appear capable of profiting from the instruction offered are also eligible for admission in most institutions. By law, this admissions policy has been assigned to the community college, which in most states must admit all high school graduates and adults who seek admission." (1968, p.1)

...then Gleazer's statement on the mission of the college is valid:

"The mission I am proposing here assumes no rigid patterns and schedules to satisfy either the 'custodial' or 'rite of passage' function. It assumes that each individual has potential and should have opportunities to develop it.

The goal of providing successful learning experiences for every student is idealistic and probably unachievable; however, that is no reason to reject it." (1973, p.88)

Gleazer then says, "There is more to life than a career," and suggests courses and programs in avocational, cultural, social, and political spheres. He says,

> "Courses and programs in these areas are just as appropriate and valuable as traditional courses, and they deserve the same support and recognition.
>
> In the final analysis, the significance and value of a learning experience depend on the learner, not on tradition or the opinions of educators." (Ibid., p.89)

It is to be pointed out that there is no area of a community college program that is beset by more confusing eddies about what is respectable and legitimate in college offerings than the job of preparing people for employment vis-a-vis transfer to the university and the bachelor's degree (Gleazer, 1973).

The Legislators want more students enrolled in vocational-technical programs and businessmen want a greater range of technical skills developed.

The March 9, 1974 issue of Business Week pointed out that there were not many jobs for well-rounded college grads, that specialization is the name of the game. Employers are swamped with applications and can afford to be very choosy. They want practical skills along with that degree. Already there's a marked trend among students away from humanities courses, and toward the sciences. The rapidly changing economic and social climate will doubtless affect the new job marked for years to come. The energy shortage is expected to spur the rising demand for engineers - currently running 31% ahead of last year, according to a recent College

Placement Council survey. Only a few years ago, the outlook for engineers was bleak. The article further pointed out that students with business and financial backgrounds are "in the catbird seat."

Also according to Gleazer, most administrators, many faculty, people in the communities, and boards of trustees express a strong desire that more attention be given to job preparation. However, there are some dissenting views particularly among recent high school graduates. (Gleazer, 1973)

The literature has authenticated Gleazer's position that the concept of responsibility and accountability to the community and/or students is a valid realistic philosophy. Also, it agrees with the Carnegie sponsored "change in education" proposal being carried out by higher education associations (see bibliography), that the colleges are responsible to more than 'rationalistic' (Thornton, 1960) university-discipline-oriented approaches, or program-oriented specialized programs which prepare the students for work! There are also societal and individual needs to be met by the institutions.

B. The second area of significance as per Roueche, Moore, Gleazer and Thornton, was in the Developmental Studies area. Specifically, S.P.J.C. has difficulties in this area. An interview

with Ms. Helen V. McLean, Department Chairman of Directed Studies, S.P.J.C., revealed that it was necessary to go out and recruit students for these programs. Also, she felt that the regular courses in Social Sciences were constructed so as to allow most students to make a "C" grade on a regular course. This removed the great need for the remedial courses and the stigma associated with such a course.

Data on the Directed Studies revealed only three courses -- Government, Psychology and Sociology -- were offered, and the student demand was low. Possible isolation and stigma (Roueche - Moore) and faculty assignments to the area could have caused problems.

The conclusion was that there was no real Directed Studies (Developmental) on campus in Social Sciences (see Thornton, 1960, p. 203).

C. The third area of significance was the transition from a traditional "junior" college to a "community" college.

In a study by one of the researchers (Worley, 1973) on this problem, the following analysis was made on the problem. The researcher used Easton's model for analysis. From Section 1, A --

"Ca.1966, fewer than 13% of SPJC students were enrolled in technical-continuing education, and in 1972 over 40%. New staff, recruitment personnel, developing specialized curriculum, administrative worker and resources problems caused an emergency planning, activating and evaluating of these technical areas. Result: Rapid expansion."

From Section I, C --

"Second, wants from program technical-education areas were processed into demands (eg., intracampus paper, Blue & White, for 3 years has listed technical-vocational-continuing education courses -- new -- while no more than 3 courses -- new -- have been offered in junior college areas). The same paper lists deletions at a high rate - foreign language, philosophy, math, religion, some behavioral sciences. Requirements for associate degrees have not integrated regular college courses into curriculum. 1974 has experienced a movement to correct this imbalance. Channel capacities are sufficient to process demands. Yet, administrators increase stress by not converting faculty demands in traditional education. Example: Community colleges have an 'open-door' policy while SPJC had a 'revolving-door' policy."

The discussion was an attempt to suggest a passive rigidity has set in SPJC whereby the two-program and discipline - are protected from each other.

"SPJC has appropriate gatekeepers to care for demand load on sub-systems. The power structure insures this with a directive to go through channels! (paper brevity does not permit an analysis of sub-systems). However, there is a wide distribution of 'gatekeepers': Almost a hydra-headed web to receive demands, and reduce demands. There is little or no room for 'unmediated inputs.' SPJC is a maze of small empires!"

Moore describes it well (1970, pp. 220-221) as he calls the administrators, chairmen, and deans "administrative sentinels" to guard against the destruction of these empires.

The researchers suggest a 40% special required curricula, a 40% general education curricula, and a 20% electives as per Thornton (1960, p. 189). This is making specific the demands of other scholars cited in this study in their attempt to bring about change to a liberal education philosophy and fact for the colleges.

VI. The Implications of Related Research on the Study:

A. The literature points toward a more "active freedom" to meet student demands (needs) at the community college. This study has attempted to construct a model on which to show the 'passive-rigidity' in this college to change.

Second, the model developed gave a method for analysis of Program-based and Discipline-based education.

Third, it gave a method for increasing the importance of student-demands and/or decreasing/increasing program-demands or course-demands.

B. Finally, the study gave a model that can be used to study the area over a three-year period to:

(a) help synthesize the Program-Discipline areas,

(b) better project enrollments in the college;

(c) aid college governance areas in decision-making.

Conclusion:

There has been no (to the researchers' knowledge) study of this type made to specifically construct this type model. Therefore, there was a paucity of literature in this area.

VII. Procedures

A. Procedures for the development of a model -- Course-Program Priority Value Matrix -- to study the Program-Course priority demands were carried out by the following method:

1. First, a program-course priority value scale for courses was arbitrarily set a 5 for Special Required courses, 4 for General Required courses, 3 for Developmental courses, 2 for suggested electives, and 1 for elective courses.

   This value priority scale was developed by (1) interviews with faculty, counselors and administrators, (2) by using college and university bulletins, and (3) by an interview with the Directed Studies Department at S.P.J.C.

2. A Program-Course Priority Value model was set up (see p.24) to compare program and course demands. The 'value scale' assigned a value to each course. The total value for each course was obtained and the highest value course was given a 1.00. All other course demands were obtained based on the 1.00 (see results, p.24), (Table II).

3. A computer 'print-out' for the total student demands for course-credit hours was obtained from the Director of Institutional Research, SPJC. Then, a demand analysis was run on the highest priority demand course (1.00) to the lowest priority demand course (.000) based on the number of credit hours per course in the Department of Social Sciences (see p. 23); (Table I).

4. A computer 'print-out' for the total cost of each credit hour per course plus interdepartmental cost was obtained from the same source (X.A.3). A cost analysis was run on each course and a 1.00 was assigned the lowest-cost per credit hour course and a rank order of cost for each subsequent course based on the 1.00 (see p.24), (Table II).

5. A program based on the formula ...:

$$Pt = \frac{A\ (P_1) + B\ (P_2) + C\ (P_3)}{A + B + C}$$

Pt = total cumulative priority value

P_1 = Program-Course Priority Matrix (1.00)

P_2 = Student Demands (.95)

P_3 = Cost/Course Hour : .50)

was fed into the computer and the data for P_1, P_2, and P_3 was then fed into the computer. The Cumulative Priority value scale was then based on the computer analysis of the three (3) factors.

The results gave a demand priority whereby each course could be ranked on a numerical scale - 1, 2, 3.... N. This was then developed as per Table II, p.

B. Analysis of Data

1. The CPPM Table I indicates a rigid program-based orientation to specialization in specific fields with the majority of the "non-university parallel" less than 5% electives. This sustains the second part of the research hypothesis: that there is a trend to perpetuate a program-technical-vocational-based education.

2. Both CPPM Table I and CRV Table II, Col. 4, indicate a discipline-based orientation Department of Social Sciences.
   a. Social Science courses were low-priority demand courses in other than university-parallel programs.
   b. Most Social Science courses were offered to meet discipline needs (i.e., university demands and faculty workloads).
   c. Most Social Science courses were offered as electives with little or no demand from the Program-oriented areas.
   d. Social Science Department showed little or no developmental studies program, per se. However, some evidences indicate that some instructors in the classroom were responding to developmental needs of students through individualized-independent approaches to student needs.

3. The model developed for Program-course demands has given statistical data for course scheduling with a priority scale (see p.24). However, the priority demands (1.00), (.95), (.50) may be changed to emphasize the value importance of each area after greater experience (study) on a time sequence, and the utilization of the model.

VIII. Results

1. The researchers' hypothesis was sustained. The dichotomy between program-based and discipline-based education was sustained in the Department of Social Sciences.
2. There was no evidence that any real change to liberal education was being affected in the results of the study. Table I indicated that only two of five required courses (Government 152 - 153) held a high demand priority in the programs at the college. Table II indicated that most social science courses have a low priority demand, and only psychology, sociology, and logic have any priority demand. These three courses are university parallel courses, per se.
3. The Department of Social Sciences has not been synthesized into the 'community college' philosophy and for two possible causes has maintained a discipline protection in attempting to hold its course offerings in a traditional perspective. (1) The Curriculum Committee and Program Areas have fallen into a continuation of the dichotomy to prepare the student for work (Gleazer, 1973, pp. 182-185). (2) The discipline orientation of the 'managers' would indicate they still think in terms of University parallel programs and do not understand

the 'community college concept' as per Gleazer, Moore, Roueche, et al.

4. The 'decision-makers' have given little or no evidence of meeting student demands (needs) as described in the liberal education vis-a-vis the Carnegie Foundation study cited.
5. The Developmental Studies area has little affect on student behavior (learning). Three courses are offered (Government, Psychology, Sociology), but the student demand was too small to measure.
6. There is one positive evidence as to some movement toward liberal education in the Individual Discovery (ID 150) courses offered in the Department of Social Sciences.

IX. Recommendations

1. The researchers recommend that the 'decision-makers' in governance adopt a policy of 40% specialization requirements, 40% general education requirements and 20% electives so the student can break-out of this rigid 'tracking' system (Moore, Gleazer, Roueche, Thornton) (Roueche, 1973, p.16).

The assumption technical students do not need liberal education has been discussed by the above scholars. All

assume this liberal need for students in a community college. And the quandary, "how to meet state, regional and other educational requirements?" is noted by the researchers. However, the change is needed now!

2. The researchers recommend that the discipline-based department, per se, move toward a modified change to allow interdisciplinary courses to be taught to meet the above demands. This would mean a movement from <u>just</u> university parallel courses.

   A synthesis between program-based and discipline-based is essential to this Department of Social Sciences if it is to survive (Gleazer, pp. 182-183).

3. The researchers recommend that the study of this <u>model</u> developed be continued over a three-year period, with more study on priority value scales and values, to give <u>governance</u> a method to make decisions based on statistically reliable data on both program and course offerings. Too many courses in Social Sciences have a low or no priority scale in the programs of the college.

PAGE(~~S~~) 23 WAS (~~WERE~~) ~~MISSING~~ (REMOVED) FROM THIS DOCUMENT PRIOR TO ITS BEING SUBMITTED TO THE ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

Table II

CUMULATIVE STUDENT COURSE PROGRAM PRIORITY MATRIX
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE	(1.00) CPPM	(.95) PSDV	(.50) PCDV	CRV	RANK/ORDER
GT 152	1.000	1.000	.880	.9755	1
GT 153	.702	.570	.877	.6865	2
PY 132	.635	.630	.764	.6594	3
SY 226	.513	.360	.760	.5041	4
LC 110	.459	.140	.650	.3692	5
PY 210	.371	.110	.773	.3518	6
PY 120	.398	.055	.750	.3368	7
PY 208	.324	.120	.747	.3312	8
ES 224	.337	.108	.700	.3223	9
EN 132	.324	.109	.690	.3153	10
PY 211	.317	.050	.780	.3080	11
ES 210	.385	.041	.650	.3057	12
ES 225	.337	.062	.670	.2893	13
EN 108	.297	.050	.750	.2937	14
EN 110	.297	.048	.743	.2915	15
SY 227	.304	.040	.740	.2906	16
HY 120	.270	.085	.700	.2860	17
PL 272	.270	.055	.750	.2846	18
PY 240	.270	.039	.770	.2825	19
EN 213	.297	.023	.745	.2822	20
HY 121	.270	.080	.680	.2800	21
HY 230	.310	.053	.640	.2777	22
PH 100	.277	.060	.690	.2771	23
PY 158	.277	.014	.750	.2712	24
HY 231	.310	.047	.600	.2672	25
RE 139	.270	.023	.720	.2661	26
PY 231	.283	.019	.684	.2625	27
HY 237	.270	.007	.730	.2619	28
SY 229	.270	.020	.700	.2608	29
SY 260	.270	.030	.670	.2586	30
RE 138	.270	.028	.660	.2558	31
PY 202	.277	.014	.660	.2532	32
SY 285	.270	.007	.630	.2415	33
ID 150	.270	.060	.490	.2335	34
EN 215	.270	.008	.580	.2317	35
GY 202	.270	.013	.550	.2275	36
SY 154	.270	.013	.540	.2254	37
ES 101	.290	.010	.450	.2141	38
GY 201	.270	.022	.450	.2106	29
PE 232	.270	.010	.450	.2059	40
PH 101	.270	.004	.340	.1811	41
PH 120	.277	.003	.000	.1142	42
EN 216	*				
EN 217	*				
HY 232	*				
HY 238	*				
PH 250	*				
PH 251	*				
SY 157	*				
SY 160	**				
SY 259	*				
UP 150	**				

*Not Offered 1973-4 - No Data
**New Course for 1974-5- No Data

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Association of American Colleges, Change in Liberal Education, a project supported by a grant from the Carnegie Foundation of New York, 1818 "R" Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20009

2. Blue and White (Faculty and Staff Announcements), Curriculum Data, Period 1971-73; St. Petersburg Junior College

3. Business Week, Personal Business, March 9, 1974

4. Educational Planning and Research, Cost Summary Report By Discipline Area Per Student Credit Hour and F.T.E. for 1972-73; St. Petersburg Junior College

5. Educational Planning and Research, Costs Per Student Semester Hour by Course and by Course Cluster, Terms III, III-B, III-A, I & 2, St. Petersburg Junior College

6. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1973

7. Moore, William, Jr., Against the Odds, Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1971

8. Roueche, John E., Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968

9. Roueche, John E. and Kirk, R. Wade, Catching Up: Remedial Education, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1973

10. Department of Social Sciences, Course Priorities, 1973, St. Petersburg Junior College

11. St. Petersburg Junior College Bulletin, 1974-75, Vol. 48, No. 1, February, 1974, St. Petersburg, Fla.

12. Van Til, William, A Perception of the Economic Education Movement, Joint Council on Economic Education, New York, 1974